Office-Supreme Court, U.S. FILED.

APR 28 1963

No. 82-1554

CLERK

Supreme Court of the United States

CHARLES E. STRICKLAND, SUPERINTENDENT FLORIDA STATE PRISON; JIM SMITH, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA, AND LOUIE L. WAINWRIGHT, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Petitioners,

VS.

DAVID LEROY WASHINGTON,

Respondent.

On Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For The Former Fifth Circuit (Unit B)

BRIEF AMICI CURIAE OF THE STATES OF ALABAMA, APIZONA, ARKANSAS, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, GEORGIA, HAWAII, IDAHO, ILLINOIS, INDIANA, IOWA, KANSAS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MAINE, MARYLAND, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, MISSISS!PPI, MISSOURI, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NEVADA, NEW HAMPSHIRE, NEW JERSEY, NEW MEXICO, NORTH CAROLINA, OHIO, OKLAHOMA, PENNSYLVANIA, RHODE ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA, SOUTH DAKOTA, TEXAS, UTAH, VERMONT, VIRGINIA, WASHINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA, AND WYOMING, IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MIKE GREELY
Attorney General of Montana
JOHN H. MAYNARD
Assistant Attorney General
Counsel of Record
Justice Building
215 North Sanders
Helena, Montana 59620
(406) 449-2026
ATTORNEYS FOR AMICI CURIAE

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Pag
INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE	
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	
ARGUMENT	-
CONCLUSION	
APPENDIX	-
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	
Commonwealth v. Borelli, Pa. Super., 431 A. 2d 1067 (1981)	***
Cooper v. Fitzharris, 586 F. 2d 1325 (9th Cir. 1978)	_
Davis v. State, Ind. App., 418 N. E. 2d 256, 267, n. 7 (1981)	
Knight v. State, 394 So. 2d 997 (Fla. 1981)	-
Lang v. Murch, 438 A. 2d 914 (Me. 1981)	-
Maryland v. Marzullo, 435 U. S. 1011 (1978)	-
People v. Fosselman, Crim. 224-84, slip op. at 15 (Cal. March 17, 1983)	
Romero v. United States, 103 S. Ct. 236 (1982)	_
State v. Hyman, S. C., 281 S. E. 2d 209 (1981)	_
State v. LePage, Idaho, 630 P. 2d 674 (1981)	_
True v. State, Decision No. 3169, slip op. at 9 (Me. March 9, 1983)	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
United States v. DeCoster, 624 F. 2d 196 (D. C. Cir. 1979)	3, 4
United States v. Green, 680 F. 2d 183 (D. C. Cir. 1982)	4
United States v. Payne, 641 F. 2d 866 (10th Cir. 1981)	4
United States v. Porterfield, 624 F. 2d 122 (10th Cir. 1980)	4
Wade v. Franzen, 678 F. 2d 56 (7th Cir. 1982)	4
Washington v. Strickland, 693 F. 2d 1243, 1261 (5th Cir. 1982)	3
White Hawk v. Solem, 693 F. 2d 825 (8th Cir. 1982)	4
STATUTE:	
28 U.S.C. § 2254	2
Constitution:	
Sixth Amendment, U.S. Constitution	2
Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Constitution	2

Supreme Court of the United States

CHARLES E. STRICKLAND, SUPERINTENDENT FLORIDA STATE PRISON; JIM SMITH, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA, AND LOUIE L. WAINWRIGHT, SECRETARY, FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Petitioners,

VS.

DAVID LEROY WASHINGTON,

Respondent.

On Writ of Certiorari To The United States Court of Appeals For The Former Fifth Circuit (Unit B)

BRIEF AMICI CURIAE OF THE STATES OF ALABAMA, APIZONA, ARKANSAS, CALIFORNIA, COLORADO, CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, GEORGIA, HAWAII, IDAHO, ILLINOIS, INDIANA, IOWA, KANSAS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MAINE, MARYLAND, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, MONTANA, NEBRASKA, NEVADA, NEW HAMPSHIRE, NEW JERSEY, NEW MEXICO, NORTH CAROLINA, OHIO, OKLAHOMA, PENNSYLVANIA, RHODE ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA, SOUTH DAKOTA, TEXAS, UTAH, VERMONT, VIRGINIA, WASHINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA, AND WYOMING, IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The States noted above, by and through their respective Attorneys General (see Appendix), appear on behalf of their citizens and file this brief pursuant to Rule 36 of the Rules of this Court.

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

As the chief legal officers of their respective states, these Attorneys General are often called upon to represent the correctional administrators of their states in federal courts in habeas corpus actions initiated pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Moreover, Attorneys General have a vital interest in the integrity of the criminal justice process of their states. With ever-increasing frequency they are required to defend state criminal convictions against Sixth and Fourteenth Amendment allegations of ineffective assistance of counsel. For these reasons, the amici have a substantial and continuing interest in the establishment of consistent standards for application in cases involving claims of ineffective assistance of counsel.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The issue of ineffective assistance of counsel can potentially be raised in every criminal case in which a conviction is obtained. Absent a controlling decision from this Court, the standards by which such claims are presently reviewed in state and federal courts vary from state to state and from circuit to circuit. No other issue so pervasively threatens our courts' ability to enforce criminal sanctions on such a fundamental level. There is a vital and immediate need for this Court to resolve the conflicts that presently exist among the states and the federal circuits and establish guidelines by which courts can begin to analyze these claims with a measure of consistency.

ARGUMENT

This Court should resolve the direct conflict between an en banc decision of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, on the one hand, and the decisions of the D. C. Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting en banc, and the Florida Supreme Court, on the other. The Eleventh Circuit, in Washington v. Strickland, 693 F. 2d 1243, 1261 (5th Cir. 1982) (Unit B) (Former Fifth) (en banc) expressly rejected the reasoning of the D. C. Circuit in United States v. DeCoster, 624 F. 2d 196 (D. C. Cir. 1979) (en banc) and "[struck] down the Florida Supreme Court's standard for reviewing ineffective assistance of counsel claims set forth in Knight v. State, 394 So. 2d 997 (Fla. 1981)." 693 F. 2d at 1287. The issue raised by this conflict is related to, but goes further than that recently addressed by Justice White in Romero v. United States, 103 S. Ct. 236, 237 (1982) (cert. denied) (White, J., dissenting). He said of the effectiveness of counsel that "[a] more fundamental question to the administration of criminal justice in the state and federal courts can scarcely be envisioned." See also, Maryland v. Marzullo, 435 U.S. 1011 (1978) (White, J., joined by Rehnquist, J., dissenting from the denial of certiorari).

While all Circuit Courts of Appeal, with the sole exception of the Second Circuit, have adopted a "reasonable competence" standard of effectiveness, or some variation thereof, the analysis by which the standard is to be applied varies dramatically. Other circuits have adopted and applied similar analysis to that established in *DeCoster*, supra. See, Cooper v. Fitzharris, 586 F. 2d 1325 (9th Cir. 1978) (en banc) cert. denied, 440 U.S. 974 (1979);

White Hawk v. Solem, 693 F. 2d 825, 827 (8th Cir. 1982); Wade v. Franzen, 678 F. 2d 56 (7th Cir. 1982). Compare, United States v. Porterfield, 624 F. 2d 122 (10th Cir. 1980); United States v. Payne, 641 F. 2d 866 (10th Cir. 1981). The D. C. Circuit continues to apply the DeCoster analysis. See, United States v. Green, 680 F. 2d 183, 184 (D. C. Cir. 1982). A number of state courts have cited DeCoster with approval and adopted modes of analysis similar to that employed by the D. C. Circuit. See, e.g., True v. State, Decision No. 3169, slip op. at 9 (Me. March 9, 1983); Davis v. State, Ind. App., 418 N. E. 2d 256, 267, n. 7 (1981); State v. Hyman, S. C., 281 S. E. 2d 209, 213 (1981); Lang v. Murch, Me., 438 A. 2d 914, 916 (1981). Other state courts have applied varied standards to these claims, standards threatened by the emerging significance of the issue and the increasing frequency with which Circuit Courts are called upon to review it. For example, in People v. Fosselman, Crim. 22474, slip op. at 15 (Cal. March 17, 1983), the California Supreme Court recently held that "a defendant may prove . . . ineffectiveness if he establishes that his counsel failed to perform with reasonable competence and that it is reasonably probable a determination more favorable to the defendant would have resulted in the absence of counsel's failings." (Emphasis added.) See also, State v. LePage, Idaho, 630 P. 2d 674, 680 (1981); Commonwealth v. Borelli, Pa. Super., 431 A. 2d 1067 (1981).

This Court's central responsibility as the court of last resort requires that it eventually resolve these fundamental conflicts. The integrity of our criminal justice process hangs in the balance. Each day that passes under the conflicting rules and varied burdens of proof currently being applied results in more criminal convictions in which the claim will eventually be raised and decided amidst a confusing amalgam of case law. The problem is pervasive and the issue complex. As a result, the need to establish a consistent standard of review is immediate.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons we urge this Court to grant certiorari and review the opinion and judgment of the court below.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of April, 1983.

MIKE GREELY Attorney General State of Montana

Justice Building 215 North Sanders Helena, Montana 59620

John H. Maynard Assistant Attorney General Attorneys for Amici Curiae

APPENDIX

Honorable Charles A. GraddickHonorable Michael J. Bowers Attorney General of Alabama Post Office Box 948 Montgomery, Alabama 36102 Atlanta, Georgia 30334 (205) 834-5150

Attorney General of Georgia 132 State Judicial Building (404) 656-4585

Honorable Robert K. Corbin Attorney General of Arizona 1275 West Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007 (602) 255-4266

Honorable Tany 5. Hong Attorney General of Hawaii State Capitol Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 (808) 548-4740

Honorable John Steven Clark Attorney General of Arkansas Justice Building Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 (501) 371-2007

Honorable Jim Jones Attorney General of Idaho State House Boise, Idaho 83720 (208) 334-2400

Honorable John Van de Kamp Attorney General of California 800 Tishman Building, 3580 Wilshire Los Angeles, California 90010 (213) 736-2304 (Sacramento (916) 445-9555)

Honorable Neil Hartigan Attorney General of Illinois 500 South Second Springfield, Illinois 62701 (217) 782-1090 (Chicago (312) 793-2503)

Honorable Duane Woodard Attorney General of Colorado 1525 Sherman Street - Third Fl. Denver, Colorado 80203 (303) 866-3611

Honorable Linley E. Pearson Attorney General of Indiana 219 State House Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 (317) 232-6201

State of Connecticut By: Austin J. McGuigan Chief State's Attorney P.O. Box 500 Wallingford, Conn. 06492 Honorable Thomas J. Miller Attorney General of Iowa Hoover Building - Second Floor Des Moines, Iowa 50319 (515) 281-8373

Honorable Charles M. Oberly Attorney General of Delaware 820 North French St., 8th Floor Wilmington, Delaware 19801 (302) 571-3838

Honorable Robert T. Stephan Attorney General of Kansas Judicial Center - Second Floor Topeka, Kansas 66612 (913) 296-2215

Honorable Steven L. Beshear Attorney General of Kentucky State Capitol Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (502) 564-4002

Honorable William J. Guste, Jr. Honorable Paul L. Douglas Attorney General of Louisiana Attorney General of Nebraska 2-3-4 Lovola Building New Orleans, Louisiana 70112 (504) 568-5575 (Baton Rouge (504) 342-7013)

Honorable James E. Tierney Attorney General of Maine State House Augusta, Maine 04330 (207) 289-3661

Honorable Stephen H. Sachs Attorney General of Maryland Seven North Calvert Street Baltimore, Maryland 21209 (301) 576-6300

Honorable Frank I. Kellev Attorney General of Michigan Law Building Lansing, Michigan 48913 (517) 373-1110

Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, III Attorney General of Minnesota Bataan Building, P.O. Box 1508 102 State Capitol St. Paul, Minnesota 55155 (612) 296-2591

Honorable William A. Allain Attorney General of Mississippi Carroll Gartin Justice Building P.O. Box 220 Jackson, Mississippi 39205 (601) 354-7130

Honorable John D. Ashcroft Attorney General of Missouri P.O. Box 899 Jefferson City, Missouri 65102 (314) 751-3321

Honorable Michael T. Greely Attorney General of Montana State Capitol Helena, Montana 59601 (406) 449-2026

State Capitol Lincoln, Nebraska 68509 (402) 471-2682

Honorable Brian McKay Attorney General of Nevada Heroes Memorial Building, Capitol Complex Carson City, Nevada 89710 (702) 885-4170

Honorable Gregory H. Smith Attorney General of New Hampshire 208 State House Annex Concord, N. H. 03301 (603) 271-3655

Honorable Irwin I. Kimmelman Attorney General of New Jersey Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex, CN080 Trenton, New Jersey 08625 (609) 292-4925

Honorable Paul Bardacke Attorney General of New Mex. Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501 (505) 982-6000

Honorable Rufus L. Edmisten Attorney General of North Car. Dept. of Justice, P.O. Box 629 Raleigh, No. Carolina 27602 (919) 733-3377

Honorable Anthony Celebrezze Attorney General of Ohio State Office Tower, 30 E. Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 466-3376

Honorable Michael Turpen Attorney General of Oklahoma Attorney General of Utah 112 State Capitol Oklahoma City, Okla. 73105 (405) 521-3921

Honorable David L. Wilkinson 236 State Capitol Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 (801) 533-5261

Hon. LeRoy S. Zimmerman Attorney General of Pennsylvania Strawberry Square - 16th Floor Montpelier, Vermont 05602 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 (802) 828-3171

(717) 787-3391

Honorable John J. Easton Attorney General of Vermont Pavilion Office Building

Honorable Dennis J. Roberts II Honorable Gerald L. Baliles Attorney General of R. I. 72 Pine Street Providence, Rhode Isl. 02903 (401) 274-4400

Attorney General of Virginia 101 N. 8th Street - 5th Floor Richmond, Virginia 23219 (804) 786-2071

Honorable Travis Medlock Attorney General of So. Car. Robert C. Dennis Off. Bldg. 1000 Assembly Street Columbia, So. Carolina 29211 (803) 758-3970

Hon, Kenneth O. Eikenberry Attorney Gen. of Washington Temple of Justice Olympia, Washington 98504 (206) 753-2550

Honorable Mark V. Meierhenry Hon. Chauncey H. Browning State Capitol Building Pierre, South Dakota 57501 (605) 773-3215

Attorney General of So. Dakota Attorney Gen. of West Virginia State Capitol Charleston, West Virginia 25305 (304) 348-2021

Honorable Jim Mattox Attorney General of Texas Capitol Station, P.O. Box 12548 123 State Capitol Austin, Texas 78711 (512) 475-2501

Hon. Archie G. McClintock Attorney General of Wyoming Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002 (307) 777-7841